

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application in light of the above amendments and following comments is courteously solicited.

Applicants respectfully request the examiner to reconsider his rejection with regard to the claims as amended herein.

The examiner in his final rejection dated February 9, 2006 rejected previously submitted claims 17-20, 22, 25-27, and 29-32 as being unpatentable over Morse in view of Hansen et al. Morse discloses a workpiece support for machining a plurality of workpieces comprising multiple jaws which can accommodate multiple and various workpieces, wherein one of the jaws shows moveable support segments for pressing the workpieces toward the other jaw. This vice shows a first and a second jaw for clamping work pieces. The first jaw reveals a multiplicity of hydraulically-operating pistons facing from one side of the jaw towards the second jaw. The second jaw corresponds to the upper pressure plate of the application, but is not translucent and not even. In contrast to the machining device of our client said moveable support segments are not moveable independently from each other relative to the face jaw. The support segments of the machining support being described by Morse are to be moved simultaneously. Therefore the plurality of the supporting segments is not suitable to press the workpieces one after another against the opposite jaw. The pistons of the prior art document can neither be set variably and independent from each other, nor be pressed selectively against the second jaw. Morse does not teach individually controllable clamps, allowing the press the workpieces with different desired contact pressures toward the second jaw. The jig clamps are all working with the same abutment pressure. The clamping pressure is not individually adjustable for each workpiece. Morse discloses

indeed working a fewer pieces than the number of the supporting segments, but this may be only a selective clamping but no selective and prescribable pressing of the workpieces arranged on the supporting segments. In respect to the application of two jaws of the workpiece support art not movable toward each other. Moreover Morse does not teach a workpiece support comprising an exchangeable jaw with supporting segments as claimed for the lower pressure plate of the invention.

Hansen et al. discloses a method for manufacturing plastic windows, comprising a plastic frame and at least one pane of transparent plastic. The pane is joined to the frame by laser welding. Thereto an abutment pressure is provided between the pane and the frame, whereby the pressure is obtained by pressing the frame and the pane between two pressing plates, at least one of them being transparent. The apparatus does not show a plurality of supporting segments for mounting and machining one or more workpieces.

Applicants have amended claims 17, 19, 21 and 26 so as to set forth with more specificity the differences between the subject matter of the instant application and the prior art references cited above. The combination of the references applied by the examiner does not lead or render obvious an apparatus and method for machining a plurality of workpieces as now claimed in independent claims 17 and 26.

The examiner rejected the previously presented claims 21, 23, 24 and 28 as being unpatentable over Morse in view of Hansen et al. and further in view of Wayman et al. Wayman discloses a workpiece support having multiple varying pressure application to provide better control of the workpiece during the machining process. Additionally cited documents US 6,031,199 A and US 5,162,008 A are teaching multiple independently controlled

clamps. These cited documents seem to be pertinent to the features claimed in claims 21, 23, 24 and 28.

Even assuming for the sake of argument that the Wayman reference discloses that which the examiner purports, the Wayman et al. reference in no way cures the deficiencies with regard to the primary and secondary references. Therefore, it is submitted that dependent claims 21, 23, 24 and 28 are patentable over the prior art for the same reasons discussed above with regard to independent claims 17 and 26.

In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that all of the claims as pending patentably define over the art of record and an early indication of same is respectfully requested.

An earnest and thorough attempt has been made by the undersigned to resolve the outstanding issues in this case and place same in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or feels that a telephone or personal interview would be helpful in resolving any outstanding issues which remain in this application after consideration of this amendment, the Examiner is courteously invited to telephone the undersigned and the same would be gratefully appreciated.

It is submitted that the claims as amended herein patentably define over the art relied on by the Examiner and early allowance of same is courteously solicited.

Appln. No. 10/667,926
Amdt. dated April 10, 2006
Reply to Office action of February 9, 2006

If any fees are required in connection with this case, it is respectfully requested that they be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-0184.

Respectfully submitted,

Jie-Wei Chen et al.

By

Gregory P. LaPointe
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 28,395
Tel: (203) 777-6628
Fax: (203) 865-0297

Date: April 10, 2006

I, Rachel Piscitelli, hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313" on April 10, 2006.

